

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/021,747		TADASHI ISHIGURO	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Tamra L. Dicus		1774	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tamra L. Dicus.

(3) M. Siegal

(2) J. Lee

(4) C. Kelly

Date of Interview: 6/15/04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed: Inaba '466; Hashimoto '157; Kato '806

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed smoothing layer desire for cleaning eyes, the protrusions are important to the cleaning function.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant argues the instant invention is to cleaning nodes and the prior art doesn't teach cleaning function. The Examiner pointed to Hashimoto col. 16/line 40, teaching dusts accumulation of fluff removal, but Applicant argued Hashimoto doesn't teach the removal of them as cleaning. Applicant argued the criticality of PU ranges as shown in spec. to argue show comparative results. Applicant will respond to summarize the points as discussed today. The office agrees to withdraw the objections as Applicant has narrowed down the claims well. Applicant will respond to the outstanding office action.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required: Cynthia Kelly